## Case 5:08-cv-03657-HRL Document 31 Filed 06/05/09 Page 1 of 3

1 2 3	COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP STEVEN L. FRIEDLANDER (154146) (friedlanders@cooley.com) BENJAMIN KLEINE (257225) (bkleine@cooley.com) LAURA A. TERLOUW (260708) (lterlouw@cooley.com) 101 California Street, 5th Floor	
4	San Francisco, CA 94111-5800 Telephone: (415) 693-2000 Facsimile: (415) 693-2222	**E-Filed 06/05/09 **
5	ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS	
6	SYMYX TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND ELSEVIER INC.	
7 8	LEVINE & BAKER LLP RICHARD E. LEVINE (88729) (rlevine@levinebakerlaw.com) One Maritime Plaza, Suite 400	
9	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 391-8177 Facsimile: (415) 391-8488	
10	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS	
11	ROBERT OLSZEWSKI, SARA BERTSCH, JACQUELI MCHALE, AND RUSSELL BLACKADAR	ne Macia, Philip
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13		
14	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
15	STRIVOSE BIVIDION	
16	ROBERT OLSZEWSKI, SARA BERTSCH,	Civil Action No. CV 08 3657 HRL
17	JACQUELINE MACIA, PHILIP McHALE, and RUSSELL BLACKADAR, individuals.	STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED)
18	Plaintiffs,	ORDER TO CONTINUE CMC AND ADR CERTIFICATION DATES
19	V.	ADRICENTIFICATION DATES
20	SYMYX TECHNOLOGIES, INC., and	
21	ELSEVIER, INC., Corporations,	
22	•	
23	Defendants.	
24	Pursuant to United States District Court for the Northern District of California Civil L.R.	
25	6-2(a), plaintiffs Robert Olszewski, Sara Bertsch, Jacqueline Macia, Philip McHale, and Russell	
26	Blackadar (collectively, "Plaintiffs") and defendants Symyx Technologies, Inc. ("Symyx") and	
27	Elsevier Inc. ("Elsevier"), by and through their respective counsel, hereby submit the following	
28	joint stipulation:	
RD		CTIBILI ATION ( ) YOUR ON OR OR OF THE

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

STIPULATION (AND <del>PROPOSED</del> ORDER) TO CONTINUE CMC, ADR DATES CV 08 3657 HRL

## Case 5:08-cv-03657-HRL Document 31 Filed 06/05/09 Page 2 of 3

1 1. Pursuant to the Court's April 16, 2009 order, the case management conference in 2 this case is currently scheduled for June 16, 2009. 3 2. Pursuant to the Court's July 30, 2008 order, the parties' deadline to file ADR certifications and either a stipulation selecting an ADR process or a notice of need for ADR 4 phone conference was set as November 4, 2008. Because defendants were not served with a 5 6 summons and complaint until early-January 2009, this date passed without compliance. 7 3. On June 2, 2009, the Court held a hearing on defendants' motions to dismiss and 8 took the motions under submission. Counsel for plaintiffs and defendants agree that having a 9 ruling from the Court on the motions to dismiss will greatly inform (a) the parties' discussions of 10 the scope and timing of discovery pursuant to Rule 26(f), (b) the preparation of the parties' Rule 11 26(f) report, (c) the discussions to be had with the Court at the case management conference, and (d) discussions between the parties concerning the potential merits of ADR. 12 13 Therefore, the parties hereby request and stipulate: 14 A) That the Court continue the case management conference until a date that is six 15 weeks after the Court's decision on defendants' motions to dismiss; and 16 B) That the Court postpone the deadline for the parties to file their ADR 17 Certifications and either (i) a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Selecting an ADR 18 Process or (ii) a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference, until a date that is 19 one week after the Court's decision on defendants' motions to dismiss. 20 // 21 // 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // // 26 27 // // 28

25

26

27

28